R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 012 510 EA 000 709

POWER STRUCTURES, SCHOOL BOARDS, AND ADMINISTRATIVE STYLE.

BY- HICKCOX, EDWARD S.
OREGON UNIV., EUGENE

PUB DATE FEB 67

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.25 HC-$1.12 28P.

DESCRIPTORS- *POWER STRUCTURE, *COMMUNITY, *SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENTS, *BOARDS OF EDUCATION, *SCHOOL COMMUNITY RELATIONSHIP, COMMUNITY STUDY, ADMINISTRATIVE STYLE, COMMUNITY INFLUENCE, POLICY FORMATION, AMERICAN EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH ASSOCIATION, EUGENE, NEW YORK CITY

POWER STRUCTURES IN DIFFERENT COMMUNITIES VARY, AND THE MAKEUP OF SCHOOL BOARDS AND STYLE OF SUPERINTENDENTS IN ANY COMMUNITY CAN BE VIEWED AS A REFLECTION OF THESE DIFFERENT POWER RELATIONSHIPS. A COMMUNITY MAY BE CHARACTERIZED BY (1) A DOMINATED POWER STRUCTURE, DOMINATED SCHOOL BOARD MAKEUP, AND SERVANT SUPERINTENDENT STYLE, (2) A FACTIONAL POWER STRUCTURE, FACTIONAL SCHOOL BOARD, AND POLITICAL-MANIPULATION SUPERINTENDENT STYLE, (3) A PLURALISTIC POWER STRUCTURE, STATUS-CONGRUENT SCHOOL BOARD, AND PROFESSIONAL-ADVISER SUPERINTENDENT STYLE, OR (4) AN INERT POWER STRUCTURE, SANCTIONING SCHOOL BOARD, AND DECISION-MAKER SUPERINTENDENT STYLE. NINETEEN SCHOOL DISTRICTS IN NEW YORK, AND TWO EACH IN CONNECTICUT, NEW JERSEY, AND PENNSYLVANIA, WERE SELECTED IN WHICH SEPARATE INTERVIEW SCHEDULES WERE ADMINISTERED TO SUPERINTENDENTS, BOARD MEMBERS, AND COMMUNITY INFLUENTIALS TO SECURE INFORMATION ACCORDING TO THE ABOVE CLASSIFICATIONS. THE FINDINGS REVEALED THAT TWO TYPES OF RELATIONSHIPS COULD BE IDENTIFIED BETWEEN COMMUNITIES, SCHOOL BOARDS, AND SUPERINTENDENTS. FIRST, IN 11 INSTANCES, ADMINISTRATIVE STYLE WAS FOUND TO BE RELATED BOTH TO THE BOARD MAKEUP AND TO THE COMMUNITY POWER STRUCTURE. SECOND, IN SEVEN INSTANCES, ADMINISTRATIVE STYLE WAS FOUND TO BE RELATED ONLY TO BOARD MAKEUP, OR THE COMMUNITY POWER STRUCTURE AND BOARD MAKEUP WERE CONSONANT BUT WERE AT VARIANCE WITH ADMINISTRATIVE STYLE. THIS PAPER WAS PRESENTED AT THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE AMERICAN EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH ASSOCIATION (NEW YORK CITY, FEBRUARY 17, 1967). (GB)

ED012510

Center for the
Advanced
Study of
Educational
Administration

UNIVERSITY OF OREGON

EA 000 709 Eugene

POWER STRUCTURES, SCHOOL BOARDS,
AND ADMINISTRATIVE STYLE

By

Edward S. Hickcox

POWER STRUCTURES, SCHOOL BOARDS, AND ADMINISTRATIVE STYLE

By

Edward S. Hickcox
Research Associate

Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration
University of Oregon
Eugene, Oregon

A paper presented to the American Educational
Research Association annual meeting,
February 17, 1967

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Prepared for presentation at the annual conference of the American Educational Research Association at New York City, February 17, 1967. M[illegible] Hickcox worked on the reported project at Cornell University under the direction of Donald J. McCarty, now Dean of the School of Education, University of Wisconsin.

Power Structures, School Boards, and Administrative Style

by Edward S. Hickcox*

I. Introduction

In a proposal titled "A Study of Community Factors Related to the Turnover of Superintendents,"[1] McCarty and Ramsey suggest that power structure varies from community to community and that the make up of local boards of education will reflect community power relationships. They hypothesize that in school districts where the administrative style of the superintendent is responsive to the power structure, stable school and community relationships will exist. Long tenure of the superintendent is one indication of such stability.

As a first step in the analysis of data collected for McCarty's and Ramsey's study, this paper examines the frequency with which different administrative styles are associated with particular community and school board power structures in twenty-five eastern school districts. A later analysis will be concerned with the incidence of long tenure in the various communities.

II. Conceptual Model

Power is the ability of individuals or groups to determine the behavior of others, even against their wishes. The structure of power within a

---

*Prepared for presentation at the annual conference of the American Educational Research Association at New York City, Feb. 17, 1967. Mr. Hickcox is a Post Doctoral Research Associate at the Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration, University of Oregon. During 1965-66, Mr. Hickcox worked on the reported project at Cornell University under the direction of Donald J. McCarty, now Dean of the School of Education, University of Wisconsin.

community refers to the relationships between individuals or groups holding power.

A. Dominated-Dominated-Servant

A community may be characterized by a dominated power structure. The concept of domination suggests that the power structure of the community is a pyramid, with a few or even one man at the top.[2] The dominant group may or may not be the economic elite of the community. The key point is that opposition viewpoints to the policies advocated by the dominant group toward school affairs do not appreciably influence the behavior of the board or the superintendent in important policy matters.

In a dominated community, the power relationships are reflected in the structure of the board of education, resulting in a dominated board. Board members are chosen on the assumption that they will "take the advice" of the community leaders or that they share the ideology of the dominant group. In such a situation, a majority on the board, or perhaps one or two powerful individuals, represents the community elites and exercises power so that policy is made in the "right" direction.

To be responsive to such a power situation suggests that the superintendent must behave as a servant if he is to act effectively as the integrator of community interests and the school program. He tends to identify with the dominant interests and takes his cues for action from them. He perceives himself as an administrator who carries out policy rather than as a developer of policy.

B. Factional-Factional-Political Manipulator

Another type of power relationship in the community has been noted by McCarty and Ramsey in a previous study in New York.[3] In this case, power is distributed more or less evenly between two groups and is labeled the factional power structure. Here there are two distinct poles of power. The relationships within each of the two poles are similar to those found in a dominated situation, although the impact of the factional structure on the role of the superintendent differs because there is likely to be a conflict between the factions on issues relating to school affairs.

In such a community, there is likely to be a factional board. Members of the board represent the viewpoint of one or the other of the factions and tend to act according to the ideology of the group they represent. One faction or the other may be in control of the board at any one time, but the balance is likely to shift as new members are selected.

In order to operate effectively in this kind of power situation, the superintendent must be a political manipulator. He takes his cues from the faction exercising power at any particular time, but he behaves in such a way that he can also work effectively with the opposing group when the power balance shifts. Rather than taking a strong stand on controversial issues, he takes a middle course, allowing himself room for retreat.

C. Pluralistic-Status Congruent-Professional Advisor

A third set of relationships is called the pluralistic power structure. Here power is diffused among many interest groups in the community with the result that no one segment has overwhelming influence on school affairs. The

dispersion of power, or the lack of domination, however, does not mean that the schools operate in a laissez-faire situation. On the contrary, there is likely to be high interest in education since people from various strata of the community may have a voice in what goes on.

In the pluralistic community, school board members are active but not rigidly bound to one interest or position. They treat each other as colleagues and are free to act as a group. Rather than a hierarchy of control within the board, there exists a community of peers whose decisions are characterized by full discussion of problems and arrival at consensus in an atmosphere of detachment from the interests of any particular segment of the community. This type of board is a status congruent board.

Since status congruent boards are likely to make decisions on controversial issues purely on the basis of the consequences to the educational system, they look to the superintendent for advice to guide them in their considerations. The administrator, relying on his expertise in educational matters, acts as a professional advisor to the board. He is not limited to carrying out policy handed down to him, nor is he forced to shape his opinions according to the ideology of the group in power. His approach can be more statesmanlike in the sense that he can express to the board alternatives to any policy and he can delineate the consequences of any action openly and objectively.

D. Inert-Sanctioning-Decision Maker

A final set of relationships in the community is the inert power structure. Here no active power relations are exercised in regard to school

affairs. Individuals or groups may express an interest but there is no evidence that ideas from the community about educational problems have serious impact on the development of policy. Selection of board members, for instance, is likely to be done by finding someone willing to take the job, regardless of his qualifications, interests or viewpoints.

The performance of the board of education in an inert situation tends to be perfunctory because board members neither represent nor receive reinforcement from citizens for expressing one viewpoint or another. When decisions have to be made, the board tends to follow the lead of the professional staff without going extensively into the appropriateness of a policy in terms of community needs or desires. It simply validates policies presented to it. It is a <u>sanctioning board</u> which does little but exercise its right to approve or reject administration proposals.

The superintendent in this situation is a <u>decision maker</u>. He does not have to take cues from any dominant groups, nor is he called on for technical advice as a basis for decision. Because of the lack of interest on the part of the board, the superintendent is not only free to initiate action on substantive matters, but he must do so if the program is to be effective.

The conceptual model may be summarized as follows:

<u>Community Structure</u>	<u>School Board Make Up</u>	<u>Superintendent Style</u>
Dominated	Dominated	Servant
Factional	Factional	Political Manipulator
Pluralistic	Status Congruent	Professional Advisor
Inert	Santioning	Decision Maker

III. Research and Analysis

In selecting the school districts to be studied, an effort was made by the investigators to include communities which varied according to geographical location, size, rural and urban characteristics, and socio-economic level Nineteen of the school districts were in New York State, and two each were in Connecticut, New Jersey and Pennsylvania. A total of fifty-five school districts were contacted and about forty agreed to participate. Data were collected from the twenty-five which best met the criteria stated above.

Separate interview schedules for superintendents, board members and community influentials were constructed, designed to obtain information which could be analyzed using the operational definitions for each category in the model.*

Teams consisting, in most instances, of four trained interviewers from the university stayed in each community for two and one half days, and conducted from fifteen to twenty interviews, each of which was tape recorded. All of the data were collected between January and July, 1966.

Within each community, the responsibility of the interviewer was to conduct and record interviews either alone or with one or more of the other team members. In addition, each person listened to the tapes of interviews in which he had not participated in that particular community. After being exposed to all the collected data from a given community, each team member submitted a written report in which he made a judgment as to which conceptual categories most nearly described the community power structure, the make up of the school board and the administrative style of the superintendent. These

---

*A list of the operational definitions may be found in Appendix A.

individual judgments were then combined into a final report which indicated interviewer consensus in regard to the particular school district. Each interviewer made judgments only on those communities in which he had been a member of the research team. Categorization of power structure, board make up and administrative style was not accepted unless at least three of the four interviewers were in agreement with each other.**

The community reports compiled from the judgments of each of the teams provide the data for the remainder of this paper.

IV. Results

The primary question at issue is the frequency with which "ideal" relationships, according to the conceptual model, can be identified. That is, how often are pluralistic communities and status congruent boards associated with professional advisor styles of administration and so on? A secondary consideration, related to this question, is the extent to which the separate conceptual categories themselves are descriptive of real world situations. Efforts to answer these questions were hampered by problems of ambiguity in the operational definitions of the categories which came to light in the attempt to fit the model to the empirical data collected.

Table I indicates the frequency with which ideal and transitional relationships were identified. An ideal relationship is one in which the superintendent's administrative style is related to school board make up and community power structure as predicted in the conceptual model, and a transitional relationship is one in which administrative style is related to school board make up but not to community power structure, or in which the board make up is related to the community structure but not to the administrative style.

**An example of a combined report for one community may be found in Appendix B.

Table I*

A

Frequency Distribution of Communities
According to Perceived Ideal Relationships

Power Structure	Board Make Up	Administrative Style	Frequency
Dominated or inert	Dominated	Servant	2
Factional	Factional	Political Manipulator	0
Pluralistic	Status Congruent	Professional Advisor	7
Dominated or Inert	Sanctioning	Decision Maker	2

B

Frequency Distribution of Communities
According to Perceived Transitional Relationships**

Power Structure	Board Make Up	Administrative Style	Frequency
(Pluralistic)	Dominated	Servant	1
(Dominated, Pluralistic)	Factional	Political Manipulator	2
(Inert)	Status Congruent	Professional Advisor	1
(Pluralistic)	Sanctioning	Decision Maker	1
Pluralistic	Status Congruent	(Decision Maker, Servant)	2

*In the seven communities of the twenty-five studied which are not reported in this table, the interviewers could not agree to any extent on the categorization. This may have reflected a condition of flux in the districts which could be considered a form of transition.

**The terms in parentheses indicate the dimensions which are not consonant with the other two.

The table indicates that eleven ideal and seven transitional relationships were identified in the twenty-five districts studied. The empirical data at least partially validates the conceptual model.

A. Ideal Relationships

1. Dominated (Inert)-Dominated-Servant

Considering first the ideal relationships, it should be noted that the dominated and inert power structure categories have been combined. This is done because the interviewers discovered that dominance in the sense of a community held in the grip of a small group of powerful men just did not occur in the sample. In the one industry towns, where one might expect domination by owners and managers of important companies, it was difficult to find active influence exerted on school affairs. The situation appeared to be identical to the case of the purely inert towns where the investigators felt that influence was not being exerted. In both dominated and inert communities, school business appeared to be detached from other community affairs.

In the two districts which had dominated boards and servant superintendents associated with an inert or dominated power structure, the boards were controlled by single individuals who had been active for a number of years. Both of these men appeared to be capable and responsible, but they did not seem to operate from any power base in the community. Neither appeared to wield power so much as to accept responsibility for what they felt had to be done. Both superintendents deferred constantly to the dominant figures on the board and were reluctant to take any position or action without the consent of their boards.

2. Factional-Factional-Political Manipulator

No purely factional situations were identified. In several districts, however, considerable factionalism was identified, although not enough to

justify a categorization in that direction. In one community, for instance, a religious split between Jewish and non Jewish elements was identified. Both factions were well organized. Regular meetings were held and leaders of each were easily identified. Most important, both groups openly nominated candidates to the board of education and conducted regular election campaigns which included rallies, posters and newspaper ads. The hesitation about identifying this district as factional came from the high degree of harmony that existed once the elections were over. The evidence did not support a conslusion that the factionalism went any deeper than the drive of each side to gain representation in school affairs.

A kind of latent factionalism centering on such issues as religion, political ideologies, race, appeared to exist in several communities. These polarizations, however, tended to become organized only on specific issues, such as elections, so that a general factional situation did not permeate school affairs. In communities where some factionalism was found, superintendents almost always mentioned it. One superintendent, for instance, in a religiously split district, had an extended school year so that he could dismiss school on seventeen religious holidays, thus keeping Jewish, Protestant and Catholic groups happy.

3. Pluralistic-Status Congruent-Professional Advisor

A wide spread interest in community and school affairs appeared to be a common element in pluralistic situations. Board members tended to express concern with educational improvement. They perceived their jobs as helping to provide the best possible program for the whole school population.

Status congruent boards, more than any other type, were concerned with reporting actions to the community, often through extensive newspaper coverage. Some members of boards of this type indicated that citizens often telephoned them for information and opinions on school affairs, and in one case a respondent who had not been on the board for several years reported receiving frequent calls on educational matters.

These boards seldom acted independently of the superintendent. His advice and counsel were sought on most issues, although the fine line between administration and policy making was of frequent concern. Some of these districts had developed statements which attempted to map out areas of policy discretion for the board and superintendent. Superintendents, acting as professional advisors, were generally free to explore several alternative solutions to problems, but they were constrained from acting unilaterally by virtue of strong community support.

4. Inert(Dominated)-Sanctioning-Decision Maker

In two districts, sanctioning boards and decision making superintendents were associated with dominated or inert communities. Individuals on sanctioning boards did not seem capable or interested in seriously discussing educational problems. There appeared to be a general distaste with serving on the board, and in both communities there was difficulty enlisting good candidates. The superintendents in these districts stated that they were often forced to initiate policy because of a lack of community and board support. Both men were respected as community leaders and were constantly being drawn into non-educational projects. One had headed a drive for a new community swimming pool and the other was the prime mover in the development of a planning commission.

B. Transitional Relationships

In the seven communities where transitional relationships were identified, certain changes which had not yet affected board make up or superintendent style appeared to have occurred in power relationships.

In one of the transitional communities, which had a factional board and a political manipulator superintendent, the basis for the factionalism was a political split on the board. Political factionalism had at one time been prevalent, but rapid population growth had brought in many short term residents, commuters and people with widely different backgrounds. This resulted in a diffusion of power away from political parties. This change had not yet reached the board which still consisted of residents elected on the basis of their partisan affiliation. Thus, the board was still factionalized although the community was not. The political manipulator role of the superintendent was apparent in events surrounding one of the principal long term struggles in the district over the selection of a school architect. The superintendent had been under pressure from the community to select the most competent firm according to objective criteria, but he was faced also with mediating a bitter partisan fight on his board about the selection. He indicated that he played a political role, but he also sensed a change in the interests of the community. He suggested this change would probably result in a different kind of board and a different style for himself within a few years.

The identification of these transitional districts has several implications. First, it can be noted that power relationships are likely to change even in ideal relationships and that, if the assumptions of this study are

valid, the change will occur first in the community and then in the make up of the board and finally in the administrative style of the superintendent. This process may be observed in two of the districts where a status congruent board was identified in a pluralist community but the superintendent style in one case was servant and in the other decision maker. The theory supporting the conceptual model would predict that disruptive effects would be likely to exist in these systems unless the superintendents modified their behavior or unless new administrators were brought in.

Second, the style of the superintendent tends to reflect the make up of the board rather than the community power arrangement in a transitional situation. In the example of the factional school board described earlier in this section, the superintendent was forced to modify his behavior to respond to the divisions existing on his board. He was uncomfortable in this because of the pluralistic structure of the community, but so long as the board retained its factional characteristics, the superintendent was forced to act accordingly.

In the seven communities for which reportable relationships were not identified for this paper, the model would predict disruptive effects in the school system unless changes occurred in the direction of ideal relationships. Assuming that the judgments of the interviewers reflected accurately the state of flux in these districts, it could be predicted that the structure of the community would stabilize over time, would eventually be reflected in the make up of the board and finally in the administrative style of the superintendent.

V. Conclusion

Two types of relationships have been identified between community environment, school boards and superintendent styles. The first occurs where administrative style is related both to the board make up and to the power structure. The second occurs where administrative style is related only to board make up or where community power structure and board make up are consonant but are at variance with administrative style.

This initial consideration of interview data indicates that it is possible to identify and categorize types of power structure, school board make up and administrative style on the basis of relatively few interviews taken by a team in a short time.

The conceptual model developed by McCarty and Ramsey, with slight modifications, proved to be an adequate basis for the discovery of theoretically important differences between school districts. It is suggested that a reconsideration of some of the operational definitions such as the meaning of domination and inertness would be valuable. Another fruitful exercise would be an attempt to find ways to pin point potential community factionalism, perhaps in terms of latent and manifest characteristics of the category.

The next step in the data analysis, which is beyond the scope of this paper, is to test McCarty and Ramsey's notion of the disruptive effects of non-ideal relationships between power structure, school boards and administative styles in the sample communities.

Footnotes

1. Donald J. McCarty and Charles E. Ramsey, "Study of Community Factors Related to the Turnover of Superintendents." U. S. Office of Education Proposal No. 5-0325-2-12-1, Jan. 1965.

2. See Floyd Hunter, Community Power Structure, Chapel Hill, University of North Carolina Press, 1953. A capsule summary of thirty-three studies in community power structure appears in a research note by John Walton, American Journal of Sociology, January 1966, pp. 430-438. Walton also discusses some of the sources from which McCarty and Ramsey developed their categories in "Discipline, Method and Community Power: A Note on the Sociology of Knowledge," American Sociological Review, Vol. 31, No. 5, October 1966, pp. 684-689.

3. Education in Levittown, Albany, New York: The University of the State of New York, September 1962, pp.437.

4. Pluralism is usually associated with the work of Robert Dahl. See, for instance, Who Governs: Power and Democracy in an American City, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1961.

Appendix A

OPERATIONAL DEFINITIONS OF THE MODEL CATEGORIES

A. Dominated Power Structure

1. Agreement of practically all parties interviewed on the persons from whom advice is sought on "big policy" matters.

2. Familiarity of professionals and lay members of community-wide organizationswith hypothesized power figures.

3. Evidence that decisions are "handed down."

4. Evidence that power figures and operating people disagree on values at some points and that values of power figures prevail in decisions.

B. Dominated Board

1. Actual instances of advice of power figures being sought by board members.

2. Indication of opinions of top power figures being carried out when board members actually would have made a contrary decision.

3. Large numbers of unanimous votes, and unanimous votes on all basic matters.

4. Long terms for board members.

5. Definite leader-follower relationship.

6. Each member knows which colleague to follow.

C. Servant Role

1. Superintendent takes cue from dominant members in controversial situations.

2. He refuses to initiate structure on substantive matters and is primarily concerned with procedural activities.

3. He seeks identification with the power structure.

D. Factional Power Structure

1. All of the oriteria of dominated power structure but at two poles of power.

2. Easily identified basis of factionalism (e.g., religion, party politics, town and gown, nationality, etc.)

E. Factional Board

1. Hotly contested school board elections.

2. Evidence of consistent sides in voting, with splits on all basic issues.

3. Chairman of Board changes when majority changes.

4. Members impute impure motives to members of the other side.

5. Two sets of definite leader-follower relationships.

F. Political Manipulator

1. Never makes strong assertions about any unresolved issues.

2. Recommendations are phrased to allow for retreat.

3. Actively avoids identification with either faction.

G. Pluralistic Power Structure

1. No agreement upon persons from whom advice is sought.

2. Lack of familiarity of persons in formal positions with each other (in large community) or lack of same persons holding formal leadership positions (in small community).

H. Status Congruent Board

1. Committee of peers; verbal expression of respect for all other members.

2. Changes of opinion in board meetings during discussion.

3. Many unanimous votes, and no consistent "sides" in voting.

4. Many questions on theory and research asked of superintendent.

I. Professional Advisor

1. Makes proposals for experimental programs and initiates changes.

2. Offers alternatives and recommendations in terms of educational purposes.

3. Quotes theory and research and writes regularly for publication.

J. Inert Power Structure.

1. Evidence of difficulty in getting people to serve in leadership positions.

2. No evidence of active experimental community wide programs.

3. General satisfaction with "status quo."

K. Sanctioning Board

1. Superintendent raises most questions, makes recommendations, and his recommendations are approved with little discussion.

2. Superintendent's recommendations to the school board are usually taken.

3. Board members evidence high respect for superintendent, with excessive number of matters referred to him as matters of "technical norms," as opposed to "moral norms" which are matters for the community.

4. Real issues do not arise in board meetings.

L. Decision Maker

1. May be consulted informally in the selection of board members.

2. Makes some unilateral decision in area of board prerogatives.

3. Recommends a limited number of policies.

Appendix B

A STUDY OF COMMUNITY FACTORS IN THE TURNOVER OF SUPERINTENDENTS

Interviewer Report on the Wilton, New York School District

The Wilton School District is located in a rural area of central New York State. The school population is 1100 students, housed at present in one large building. The present facility is overcrowded, but a site for a new building has recently been acquired.

The community has one fair sized industry which produces light fixtures plus several small plants. Agriculture remains an important industry, although large and prosperous farms were not much in evidence.

The area has not shown spectacular growth, even though there is room, but a new super highway is cutting through the town and may bring in new residents who will find it feasible to commute to these metropolitan centers from Wilton. At the moment, however, the town is isolated, both culturally and physically, from large metropolitan areas. Somehow even the influence of a large university, which is close by, does not seem to affect the town.

The supervising principal for the last two years has been Mr. Charles Tompkins. He came to Wilton from a principalship in a suburban area near New York City because he wanted to get away from pressures associated with that kind of life.

There is a five man school board which is elected for five year terms, one member coming up for election each year.

I. The Community

A. Dominant Yes No x x x x The interviewing team rejects the dominant classification because:

1. Power figures in the community are not readily identifiable. Even the mayor had difficulty picking out more than one or two people.
2. These influentials who were identified do not seem to have any influence or even interest in school affairs.
3. The few influentials who were identified did not constitute a closed group.
4. Decisions are rarely made, let alone handed down.
5. There is no evidence, or very little, of disagreement on values held between community leaders and school personnel. In fact, on the recent site acquisition, only one person, apparently, and he was hardly an influential, objected with any force to this major move.

B. Factional Yes No x x x x The interviewing team rejects the factional classification because:
1. No strong poles of power are identified. There is a kind of incipient faction in the form of a very strong, fundamentalist Baptist group, but they don't seem to be making any real waves.
2. There are groups, but in terms of power they are not of much interest to citizens outside the groups.
3. There is no evidence of any ethnic division.

C. Pluralistic Yes No x x x x The interviewing team rejects the pluralistic classification because:
1. Board members do not represent any particular group, with the possible exception of one representing the Baptist congregation.
2. There is a general lack of interest in community and school affirs by community groups.
3. There is little interest in political affairs.
4. The few people who are the "doers" in the community are well known to everyone. That is, people don't stay within their interest groups.

D. Inert Yes x x x x No The team accepts the inert classification because:
1. It is difficult to get people to run for any office in town, and there is almost never a contest.
2. People are satisfied with the status quo. At the same time they are appreciative of the way their schools are run.
3. Only a few people bear the burden for community action (the editor of the paper is one), and they do this as a result of a leadership vacuum and not for any great desire to wield power or express a point of view.
4. It is difficult to make an issue of anything.
5. Both the editor of the paper and the supervising principal classified the community as inert on direct question.
6. No issues of consequence could be identified.
7. Attendance by the public at school board meetings is almost always zero.
8. Community influentials have little knowledge of school affairs.

II. Board Classified

A. Dominated Yes No x x x x The team rejects the dominated classification because:
1. Voting is usually unanimous.
2. There is no evidence of one member dominating the board.
3. There doesn't seem to be anyone to dominate.
4. Evidence indicates that the board would not make a decision contrary to what the supervising principal desired.
5. There is no evidence that board members seek the advice of community leaders.

B. Factional Yes No x x x x The team rejects the factional classification because:
1. Elections are not hotly contested. A possible faction exists with the fundamentalist Baptist Church but this group is far from deeply involved or interested in community affairs.
2. The previous superintendent had a tenure of twenty-five years.

C. Status Congruent Yes No x x x x The team rejects the status congruent classification because:

1. No kind of "pecking order" is evident on the board.
2. There is open discussion of issues which would fit this classification, but there do not seem to be issues to discuss very often, beyond the ordinary routine ones.
3. The superintendent is obviously deferred to by board members. There is verbal respect for all board members and no impure motives are attributed to fellow members. Still, there does not seem to be enough leadership or force on the board at the present time to make it a true decision making group.

D. Sanctioning Yes x x x x No The team accepts the sanctioning classification because:

1. The supervising principal is deferred to on almost all issues. The new site acquisition is a good example.
2. The supervising principal is highly respected by all board members.
3. Few real issues are ever fully discussed by the board, even though the supervising principal would like to have it do so.
4. The board definitely looks for leadership from the supervising principal. It is not quite a "rubber stamp" board, but it really hesitates to question the supervising principal.
5. In a sense, the views and actions of the board are those held and initiated by the supervising principal.
6. The community does not seem to object to the leadership provided by the supervising principal.

III. Superintendent Classified

A. Servant Yes No x x x x The team rejects the servant classification because:

1. There is no evidence that the board dominates the supervising principal.
2. The board respects the decisions of the supervising principal.
3. The accomplishments of the chief school officer have earned the genuine respect of the school and the community.
4. Influentials in the community (news editor for example) go directly to the supervising principal with problems, seldom to board members.

B. Political Manipulator Yes No x x x x The team rejects this classification because:

1. He's not a man who leaps in with strongly stated opinions on issues. He states his main objective as "raising the aspirations of the community." In other words, he's not so concerned with factions as he is with getting any kind of reaction to problems.
2. There don't seem to be any factions to manipulate.
3. He has no need to leave a way open for retreat, at the moment. Everything he proposes has been accepted, so far.

C. Professional Advisor Yes No x x x x The team rejects this classification because:

1. The board generally looks for and accepts his recommendations.
2. His leadership ability is generally recognized and sought, in addition to his advice. Usually he presents all sides of a problem, but the board seldom acts without his approval, and wouldn't consider doing so.
3. The board seems to want him to run the show.
4. He doesn't quote theory or research or publish. He said he seldom, to his own chagrin, has contact with university people, other than teachers he hires.
5. He would like to be a professional advisor, but the board and the community don't seem capable of permitting him this role, at least at their present stage of sophistication.

D. Decision-maker Yes x x x x No The team accepts this classification because:

1. He participates in all decisions with the exception of selection of board members, and this reluctance is a deliberate and not always easy effort on his part.
2. He knows he is looked to for decisions and is worried, even, that more discussion on issues like consolidation does not take place outside of his own office.
3. His "professional advisor" role is only overt. The board wants to be compatible in his direction.
4. He appears to have filled a vacuum which existed before his arrival.

General Summary

The team had very little question about classifying this situation.

In regard to the community, there is just a suggestion of pluralism or factionalism (Baptist Church), but there is a genuine lack of activity in the community on school affairs or otherwise. This inertness is more than tacit agreement with what goes on. It has to do with a general lack of community consciousness and cohesion. The editor of the paper pointed out, for instance, that there is very little socializing done in the town among the more influential people. They all know each other, of course, but it doen't seem to occur to them that they all have common problems. It's a great place to meditate, as one of the interviewers said.

In regard to the school board, it shows some interest in its responsibilities but is not vitally involved in school affairs. For one thing it is very happy with the way things are going, and it certainly doesn't want to move ahead too fast. The tax levy, for instance, is not even up to the state minimum. The board sees its job as handling personnel problems, kids in trouble, routine matters.

In regard to the supervising principal, the team agrees that he is forced into the decision making role, almost against his will. His capability, though, has enabled him to handle the position in superb fashion. He is perfectly conscious of his role, even identified it from the model himself, but he is professional about it and is not out to grab power or anything like that. He is anxious to get things into such a state that he can assume a role as a

professional advisor. He does think that some factions might emerge over the building of the new school, but he almost would prefer that to complete lack of discussion.

The team feels that this community fits the model very well. It feels also that despite the inertness of the community, the supervising principal by playing the role required in the model is running an effective system.